



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-1207

Issued Date: 04/03/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

#### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The Named Employee attended meetings involving emergency dispatch and communications agencies.

#### **COMPLAINT**

The complainant alleged the Named Employee yelled at, bullied and threatened staff members of other emergency dispatch and communications agencies, did not offer a proper apology for his behavior, and has impeded the working relationship between SPD and these agencies.

#### **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interviews of SPD employees

## **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

There was ample evidence from the OPA investigation to show that many managers and professionals from other public safety agencies found it unpleasant to work with the Named Employee. With one exception, those with whom OPA spoke consistently reported that they found the Named Employee to be intimidating, loud, aggressive in tone and rude. Specific behaviors such as shouting, using his size to intimidate others by “standing over” or too near them, pounding the table, and using an angry tone of voice were reported. It was clear that the Named Employee’s behavior created a problem for SPD in that personnel from other agencies felt his behavior reflected poorly on SPD. At the same time, there was no evidence to suggest that the Named Employee intended to intimidate or bully others, nor was it reported that he used profanity or any other form of inappropriate language. While in the short term the Named Employee’s behavior may have been somewhat detrimental to SPD’s effective working relationship with other agencies, the evidence supported the conclusion that the most damage was done to his own effectiveness and reputation and the OPA Director did not believe the Named Employee’s actions rose to the level of a policy violation warranting discipline. At the same time, the OPA Director did think the evidence strongly suggested the need for the Named Employee to effectively address several areas in need of immediate attention: leadership, interpersonal communication, collaboration and effectively dealing with conflict. The OPA Director strongly encouraged the Department to assist the Named Employee in these areas with effective training and development activities.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1**

#### Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times*.

**Required Training:** The Department should seek out and make available to the Named Employee training and development activities to assist him in becoming more effective in the following areas: leadership, interpersonal communication, collaboration and effectively dealing with conflict.

*NOTE: The Seattle Police Department Manual policies cited for the allegation(s) made for this OPA Investigation are policies that were in effect during the time of the incident. The issued date of the policy is listed.*